

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. Reconsideration of the subject patent application in view of the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for granting a telephone interview, which occurred on October 28, 2010. The participants were Examiner James Hook and attorney Nobuhiko Sukenaga. Claim 1 as currently amended was discussed during the interview, along with the cited Glejbol, Greco and Braad references. The Examiner agreed during the interview that the current amendment to claim 1 appeared to distinguish the claimed subject matter over the cited combination of references.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-11, 14-24, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glejbol in view of Greco and Braad. Claim 1 has been amended and now recites, "an *outermost* protective sheath surrounding the armouring layer, wherein said *outermost* protective sheath comprises at least two protective layers of helically wound composite wires, said at least two layers being wound with essentially opposite winding angles..." As discussed during the interview, the cited references do not teach the claimed *outermost* protective sheath comprising at least two protective layers of helically wound composite wires wound with essentially opposite winding angles. In Glejbol the outermost layer is outer layer 11, which lacks two oppositely-wound layers. In Greco, the outermost layer is outer cover 14, which also lacks two oppositely-wound layers. In Braad, the outermost layer is outer sheath 7, which also lacks two oppositely-wound layers. The Examiner agreed during the interview that claim 1, as

currently amended, would appear to overcome the prior art rejection. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1.

Claims 2-3, 5, 6, 8-11, 14-24, 26, and 27 which are directly or indirectly dependent from claim 1 should be allowable for at least the same reason as claim 1.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. NKTR-46756.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By:   
Brad C. Spencer – Reg. No. 57,076

1801 East 9th Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700

Date: November 8, 2010